THEOLOGY

VOL. LVII JANUARY, 1954 No. 403

of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

Editorial

THE Regius Professor of Divinity at Cambridge in his inaugural Lecture[1] called attention to the remarkable fact that a few years ago the Statutes of the University were amended so as to assert that its teaching officers not only must devote themselves "to the advancement of knowledge" in their subject and "give instruction therein to students", but must also "promote the interests of the University as a place of education, *religion*, learning and research" [italics ours]. Although a formula of that kind already had a place in the Statutes of most of the Colleges in the University, it had never before appeared in the Statutes of the University itself. It seems that in 1949 "religion" was inserted in this formula as an afterthought and indeed without anyone having given much thought to the meaning that the word would bear or ought to bear in this context. One speaker suggested at the time that the word "piety" should be substituted since the reference to an undefined "religion" was likely to raise scruples, but it was more or less officially stated that "there was little danger that it would be misunderstood to mean either some particular religion or a whole mass of religions". What then should it be understood to mean?

No one before Prof. Burnaby appears to have given any close thought to this question, and no one could more fittingly do so than the head of the Divinity Faculty. It is a question of more than academic interest, since the word "religion" is commonly used in many other contexts where failure to define its meaning is much less surprising than it is in the statutes of a university. Perhaps the use of the word "religion"—alongside education, learning and research—for an element in the acknowledged purpose of Cambridge University is "no more than a good-humoured, even an affectionate gesture—a salute to academic history". Prof. Burnaby glances at this possibility, but he prefers to think " that something more serious is intended". The motives of those who approved the mention of religion in so prominent a place may be unascertainable, but we ought to be able to discover whether there was and is a reasonable justification for it.

Prof. Burnaby suggests that, while for obvious reasons the word "religion" in such a context cannot now be taken to mean Christianity, it can be taken to mean something clear and positive and extremely important. He refers to John Oman's view that the "judgment of the sacred", or the ascription to certain things of absolute value, is the distinguishing mark of the religious attitude. If this definition were accepted, then "to hold oneself bound unconditionally to serve an ideal end recognized as sacred is to have religion". Prof. Burnaby argues that there are good grounds for maintaining

[1] *Education, Religion, Learning and Research*. By J. Burnaby. Cambridge University Press. 2s. 6d.

that religion in this sense is necessary to all who are devoted to the pursuit of learning and research and who are responsible for the work of education. The University can therefore rightly call upon its teaching officers to acknowledge that they are committed to the promotion of religion. By a transition which we do not altogether follow, he goes further and concludes that non-Christian dons may be taken to accept "the two great Commandments of the Gospel"—to love and serve God and the neighbour. "Whoever accepts these conditions (i.e. the two supreme and all-embracing duties of man), in whatever sense he understands them, as sacred, and refuses his assent to any line of action that appears to violate them, is surely a religious man".

Whether this conclusion be deemed satisfactory or not, Prof. Burnaby has done more than address to the University of Cambridge a wholesome question for self-examination. He has shown how loose talk about "religion" may be turned in other contexts also to good effect by insistence that the word be given a definite meaning. Moreover, he has given an example of how to tackle men who subscribe vaguely to "religion" and to similar indeterminate concepts. They should not—at least, to begin with—be charged with hypocrisy, or thoughtlessness, or woolly mindedness: the question should be pressed upon them whether they are not making a profession of faith, or confessing a presupposition, to which they really want to be committed, although they have never taken the trouble to articulate it.

In the second half of his lecture Prof. Burnaby discusses the function of the Faculty of Divinity. He sharply dissents from a declaration, made by A. C. Headlam at Oxford in 1918, that "the purpose of a Theological Faculty is to train ministers of religion". "I cannot but regard this as a gravely mistaken judgment", says Prof. Burnaby, "and I hope that the Faculty of Divinity in this University will never consent to be treated as a seminary for ordinands". Of course, this does not mean that he considers that ordinands should be discouraged from reading theology in the university. Quite the contrary. He believes that the Divinity Faculty, like other faculties, will best serve those who study in it if it has the broad aim of educating them in its proper subject rather than giving them a narrowly vocational training. The proper subject of the Divinity Faculty is Christian theology and, while this fact sets to its members problems of commitment which do not apply in other faculties, they share with members of other faculties the obligation to be "religious" in the "statutory" sense. Although the teaching of theology in the university is not subject to the direction or censorship of any ecclesiastical authority, the less palpable authority to which it is subject may be both more spiritual and more exacting. On a long view the Church itself and its ministry benefit from the freedom of university teachers. "The faith of the Christian theologian is faith in the presence of the Spirit of truth, guiding into all truth those who will follow with reverence and without fear. This faith, this reverence, and this fearlessness, are the virtues for which he must continually pray, and which he must seek to foster in his pupils by exhibiting them in himself."

Mural Paintings in Churches

ALTHOUGH Christianity was born in a country that, by a rigid and literal interpretation of the third commandment, had reduced the visual arts to insignificance, it grew up in a wider part of the world, where painting and sculpture had reached the highest perfection and formed an integral part of life. The temples, the public and private buildings, and the streets of the Mediterranean cities, were full of works of art which expressed the beliefs and ideas and the inborn creative joy of their makers. It was only natural that the new religion, in spite of its severe and other-worldly character, should have been invaded very soon by the all-powerful pagan art. The earliest Christian paintings in the Roman catacombs are entirely in the manner of other contemporary work; what Biblical personages appear in them are represented very much like Greek or Roman mythological figures. Christ and Apollo are almost indistinguishable for a long period, and only in the fourth century, under Byzantine influence, does the conception of the bearded, stern, majestic ruler of the universe appear, which indicates the complete transformation and integration of art in a Christian world.

For more than fifteen centuries the genius of Christianity continued to inspire the arts; and in wave after wave of changing styles, in ever-new interpretations of the sacred truths, the splendour of European painting was poured forth to glorify the divine mysteries and to fill the hearts of the multitude with wonder and fervour. If the artists received from their faith the great blessing of inspiration, and from the Church the tasks which called forth all their power and skill, they in turn gave shape and reality to the Christian cosmos, and created the types under which the Biblical figures are seen.

The churches of Europe bear witness to this co-operation between religion and art, not only in the famous frescoes of the great masters, but in the innumerable more modest works with which the walls of large and small churches were covered. Everybody knows that Italian churches were decorated; but few people have seen the grandiose murals of great visionary power and bold design which were executed in many French churches during the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, or the equally imposing paintings of Byzantine style that completely cover the interior of the Yugoslav churches. In this country, too, there are traces of large-scale decorations which escaped destruction during the various iconoclast upheavals and show that mural paintings, although usually of a more modest and simple character, did at one time adorn large and even quite small churches. Unfortunately, large-scale religious painting here never recovered from the Puritan blight; but on the Continent the tradition was carried on and came to a last great flowering in the dramatic frescoes of the baroque, till it ended, late in the eighteenth century, with the superb paintings of Tiepolo, the last and one of the most accomplished in an unbroken line of great masters.

With the waning of the force of religion in the nineteenth century

336363

the arts turned more to secular motives; and, as architecture, which forms the support and background to mural painting, lost the ability to create new styles and fell to repeating classical or Gothic formulas, the church painters came to follow uneasily in similar veins, till their pictures lost all conviction and artistic truth. In a time of the most trite and most laboriously concocted monumental painting, only a few artists, like Delacroix and Puvis de Chavannes, managed by a purely personal effort to achieve great and sincere mural work. Unfortunately there stepped into the breach the army of commercial church furnishers who, with plaster saints, oleographs and brass fittings, satisfied the new generations of clergy and laymen who had neither taste nor experience.

And now, in these late days, under a sky darkened by the smoke of our industrial civilization, where does church painting stand? What chance is there for the creation of inspired, vital, and truly contemporary work in a world where religion and art occupy only corners; where churchmen are usually without aesthetic interests and without knowledge of modern art, while artists are no longer inspired by the world of the Bible? How can a new religious art be created which can spring only from a religious renaissance, while we live in times that seek salvation in the manufacture and accumulation of consumer goods? And, chiefly, is there any reason why an art that, though once great, has been dying for a long time and is now only sporadically producing really live work, should be revived at all?

To begin with the last point. It is said that church paintings belonged essentially to a period when illiterate crowds read in them the story and tenets of their religion. But do we not live in times when less and less is read, when the illustrated newspaper and magazine, the cinema and television, supply the material out of which people build their world? If these people are to be drawn away from their gaudy and materialistic ideas and led towards a vision of which the majority to-day has practically no conception, they must be given something visible that will take root in their minds and serve as a starting-point for their imagination. To come into church and to empty one's mind of the clamour and jumble of the outside world is a difficult task, but one that can be made easier by fixing one's attention on an object, a symbol of the aim to be attained. This symbol, this starting-point, may be an insignificant or ugly thing, if the mind using it is well stocked and knows the direction in which it wants to move. To the impoverished and directionless modern mind, however, the symbol should be an intimation and a vision of the realm to be reached; it should be an image strong, beautiful, mysterious. It should also be modern and thus show that the world it represents is eternal, and of our time as much as of the past. The men and women living in our drab cities, and working in dreary places, long intensely for light and colour and a cleansing emotional experience, which a beautified church can give them.

If then the need exists, is it possible to create religious art in a secular world? A need, the awareness of a necessity, and the longing for something to happen, are seldom strong enough to produce the

desired movement. Just as there exists to-day a longing for religion rather than a new religious idea and force, so we must not expect a new wave of religious art to sweep the countries, but rather a stirring amongst artists and a strong and earnest desire to attempt religious work. Art has during the last decades gone through an evolution which has led it farther and farther away from the public and has now reached a point where the artist, in the isolation of his studio, produces things which are incomprehensible to anyone except himself and a small clique of adherents. A common language and critical standards exist no longer. In this impasse many of the more thoughtful artists feel the need for a reorientation; they want to become members of the community once more, to fill themselves with a more than personal idea, and to work to a given, not a self-imposed, task; and so they hesitantly and rather self-consciously approach religious subjects. To devote their efforts to a high task and to undergo the disciplinary efforts which the Church and the architect will demand from them seem to many the way to the future.

The general conditions in art are not unfavourable. There has been a great change in the style of painting; the dark, old-masterly, brown pictures, which were so very unsuitable for church walls, have fallen from favour, and so has the heavy naturalism of the Victorians. We paint to-day in a lighter key, in colours more varied, rich and delicate than ever before, and more suited to wall decoration; and our freer and more imaginative draughtsmanship and stronger sense of composition are more akin to the early and best kinds of mural than to the dark and academic work of our immediate predecessors. Modern painting also blends in well with architecture to form that unity between building and decoration which was one of the greatest assets of the early masters and has been lost in the past century.

The painter must, however, learn many things. He must learn to strike a balance between the traditional and his personal conception of a given subject. He must not do pastiches of old art, however much his patrons might desire them; no good art was ever made by imitation, and the Church or the artist that lack the courage to be of their own time cannot give much to their contemporaries. On the other hand, the artist must realize that, however deep his religious feelings, he cannot unreservedly inflict them on other people in a place of public worship. Failure to understand this has led, in recent years, to the creation of many profoundly felt, but grotesque or absurd, works which expressed the artist's ideas and emotions but shocked and hurt the intimate feelings of many worshippers. The artist must learn to subordinate himself to the task and to give of his best while serving the needs of the Church. He must also learn to serve the building; a mural should look as if it had grown out of the wall; it should echo the style and the structure of the architecture. A mural is not an independent thing; one of the reasons why early ones look so right in their place is their modesty; they never forget that they are only part of a larger whole. Not that wall paintings should be pale, sketchy or rudimentary; but, with all possible perfection and beauty, they should melt into their background as if they had always

been there. This quality of fitting in is perfectly compatible with modernity in style. It is not necessary to do an imitation Gothic painting in a Gothic church; one can do a modern paraphrase which takes up the old compositional rhythm and devises a colour scheme that blends in, without using the actual Gothic forms and ornaments. But this requires tact, and to the modern artist, used to complete autonomy and self-sufficiency, it is not an easy proposition.

The clergy who would like to see their churches embellished have a good deal to learn too. The great patrons of the past lived close to the artists and understood and furthered the artistic trends of their time. It is essential that to-day again churchmen, whether as patrons or as members of the many committees which decide the fate of projected work, should familiarize themselves with art. To have seen some old masters, often only in reproductions, is not enough. The language of twentieth-century painters, even the more conventional ones, is as different from that of Giotto or Raphael as a sermon by a contemporary preacher from one by Savonarola; yet it is the language of our time, and understood and felt as such by most people and particularly the younger generation. Art is never easy to comprehend, whether it be music, painting, or poetry; but the artist has the right to expect that whoever undertakes to judge his work and its fitness for the Church has taken the trouble to acquaint himself with it and with contemporary art in general, and is genuinely interested in it.

Apart, however, from the fact that new paintings should be executed in the style of their time, there is the question of how far they should conform to religious doctrine and Church tradition. Quite clearly, if the painting relates a story, it must be told in conformity with the Bible; if holy personages are represented, they should bear at least certain of the features under which they are familiar to most people. To paint a picture of Christ with flaming hair and the general physique and likeness of a Nordic sun god seems as wrong as to portray him like a degenerate in the last stages of consumption and dejection, both of which exaggerations have been seen of late. On the other hand, conformity to tradition, which often means the tradition of a limited place and time, must not be understood too narrowly if it is not to stifle the artist. To decree that figures must be arranged in a certain order, or must hold their hands and feet in certain attitudes, was the rule in Byzantine painting which produced works of incomparable beauty before it gradually petrified; but European art has always thriven on change and needs the freedom which permitted artists as remote from each other as Giotto and Michelangelo to treat the same subject so differently and yet equally convincingly. The pictures of the Last Supper by Duccio, Leonardo, El Greco, and Veronese are entirely different in the style of painting, the arrangement of the figures, their expression, gestures, and clothes; yet they are all serious, valid representations of an event of which only one facet can be caught at a time. The modern artist must be permitted, if his work is to have any sincerity, to discover afresh the meaning and the pictorial aspect of his theme.

I have thrown up a good many difficulties besetting the revival of mural painting in churches; however, most of them can be overcome with practice. As in every other branch of activity, it is only by doing a great deal of work that one finds out how it should be done; and only when many paintings have been executed will we become so familiar with the practice and the problems, and have gained sufficient freedom, that masterpieces can come within our reach. That is how art grew in olden times; always from the bottom up, with the masters reaping the experience of all their humble predecessors.

In Switzerland, France, Italy, and the northern countries a great number of often very ambitious murals have been painted during the last decades, in old and new churches; and whoever has seen many of them will agree that a strong impulse, a new ardour, faith, and contemporary awareness, glow in them, and that they can fill the beholder with excitement and joy or awe. In this country, too, a beginning has been made under the leadership of enlightened patrons such as Dr Bell, Bishop of Chichester, and Canon Hussey of Northampton. The paintings of Stanley Spencer at Burghclere, which are full of visionary power and endlessly rich in detail; the terrifying dramatic Crucifixion by Graham Sutherland at Northampton; the colourful and gay decorations with which Duncan Grant and Vanessa Bell have covered the walls of Berwick church; these are only examples of much fine work done lately.

What seems to stand in the way of a wider use of mural painting is not lack of interest so much as of practical knowledge. Where would a mural be suitable and where not? Where would one find the right artist for the particular job? What subject should one choose? How much would it cost; how long would it take to do; how long will it live? What preparations are necessary; what kind of wall, and plaster, and paint, are right; what formalities have to be complied with? Where can one see examples?

I wish some interested people, a group of churchmen and artists, would draw up a pamphlet; this should contain a short historical part, giving the reader an idea of the splendour of the past; then descriptions of modern work, here and abroad; a technical part, going fully into all the questions mentioned; and the whole as plentifully illustrated as possible in these economical days.

For a long time now man as an individual has been losing weight; from a responsible person before the eye of God he has slipped down to being an anonymous cog in the big machine; a political, social, economical unit, moving in the mass, conditioned, tabulated, and dispatched. In art this change is reflected in the disappearance of the human figure, except in a mechanical and robot-like shape, and in the growth of abstract art from which human reactions are as far as possible excluded. The private patron is fast disappearing; the State and other Public Bodies are stepping in to use the artist for their own purposes. Is this not the moment for the Church, the oldest and in the past the greatest patron of them all, to step in; to thaw with the warmth of her breath the frozen constructions in which modern art is

likely to lose herself; to recognize how near to her spirit the work of the artist can be, how great the inspiration is which she can give him, and how gladly he will use his gifts for the glory of God and the embellishment of his house?

HANS FEIBUSCH.

Theological Issues of Contraception[1]

No discussion of contraception is adequate which does not include an examination of the theology of sex and marriage. Some Churches have limited their pronouncements concerning sex behaviour to assertions about the psychological consequences of various sexual practices, instead of uttering a prophetic message grounded upon Christian convictions concerning the nature of man and the Will of God. In other quarters of church life the approach to sexual questions has been so closely tied to traditional doctrines that insufficient consideration has been given to the emergence of new factors which must be included in any final moral judgment (e.g. the nature of the process of ovulation in woman is a relatively recent discovery).

The proper method of examination would be to take advantage of the very considerable body of traditional Christian teaching which has been worked out over many centuries, and then to evaluate this alongside new insights—Biblical and scientific—which we now possess.

If we begin with the traditional distinctions between the motive of an action, the act itself, and the consequences of the act, we may say that while the doctor, sociologist, and psychologist are mainly concerned with the good or bad *consequences* (for health or society) of sexual acts, and the moralist is primarily concerned with the quality of the *motives* of the agent (doer of the act), the theologian is primarily concerned with the "*act* itself"—and the extent to which its "object" is fulfilled or frustrated.

The Doctrine of Creation

This theological concern with the act derives from the doctrine of Creation. It is a cardinal tenet of Christians and other theists that God created the human body, with its organs and functions. The reason why God has given man a particular organ (e.g. the eye) is as a rule easily deduced from a study of what in fact the organ does (its "object", see below). It is, therefore, normally possible to discover by observation what is the object of any particular act which involves the use of a bodily organ. Since it is an axiom that a man has a duty to do the Will of God as far as he can see it, it follows that a man "ought" so to use his physical organs that they fulfil, rather than frustrate, their natural "object". To do deliberately an act which is "unnatural" (fails to arrive at its object) is *prima facie* a sin.

---

[1] Address given to the Ecumenical Conference on "The Church and Marriage" at Bossey, April, 1953.

Biblical Doctrine of Sex

In discussing, therefore, the subject of contraception we have to ask what is the object of any act of intercourse.

That it is closely related to relations between men and women is obvious from observation of the genital organs themselves. They are so constructed that physical union can be effected between a man and a woman. We have, therefore, first to ask what is God's Will in respect of sexual relations in general between men and women, of which the act of coitus is but one (very important) aspect.

The Biblical answer is clear. In Genesis 1. 26 God is described as "making man in our image". In chapter v verse 2 this is clarified: "Male and female created he them, and called their name Adam" (Man). There is set out the fact that the basic sociological unit of humanity is not *that man* and *that woman*, but the man-woman nexus. Thus we are confronted with a relational "unit" as the foundation element in the structure of human society—a fact which is not surprising when we recall that man is made in the "image of God"; for God is relational. Developed thinking about the nature of God has resulted in the doctrine of the triune relational nature of the Godhead. We may, in an analogical sense, speak of the "bi-unity" of man and woman—the male-female nexus. It follows that all Christian discussion of the place of woman (and man) in society must *begin* with the fact of this implicit bi-unity, which may or may not crystallize in particular cases into the more specific and intimate bi-unity of marriage.

The Nature of Coitus

In the specific form of the sexual encounter which we call coitus, personal factors are deeply involved. Because man is personal, coitus can never be more than what it is for an animal. Indeed, this personal involvement is present in many other physical acts between persons. A smile, a handshake, a kiss, a caress, are all more than physical acts. They are divinely ordained means by which "relation" (often emotionally conditioned) between persons is both expressed and enriched.

Coitus, however, stands out and apart from all other physical "relational" acts. In Biblical terms, an act of coitus effects a "one flesh" relationship. St Paul saw this clearly even in the act between a man and a harlot. For in all such acts (except rape) there is a degree of consent and mutual commitment. If experience did not itself confirm this fact, we have our Lord's own emphasis upon the Genesis teaching about the "one flesh" unity (*henosis*)[1] established by the coitus of man and woman. He adds: "Whosoever shall put away his wife and marry another commiteth adultery." A re-marriage of this sort "adulterates" the established relationship, but no more destroys it than adulterating milk with water destroys the milk—it merely changes its quality. Once coitus has established

[1] For an important discussion of the use of *henosis* in this connexion, see *The Mystery of Love and Marriage* by D. S. Bailey.

henosis (one flesh), something has begun to happen at the ontological level. For this reason the relationship between God and Israel is represented as a marriage. Israel may go after other gods (adultery), but this disloyalty does not destroy God's relationship with Israel, as "their God". So a husband and wife are always husband and wife until one of them dies, whatever the degree of disloyalty or desertion may be.

Union and Procreation

From one point of view it is very odd that God should have so created man and woman that the physical act which expresses their love at its profoundest level should in fact be so closely related to the reproductive processes. If, however, it is a fact that this expressive act of love establishes an ontological "one flesh" relationship between a man and a woman, then we have the safest of all personal environments into which a child can be born. No child can be born until a "one flesh" unity has been established between a man and a woman. This unity (*henosis*) is invalid when it occurs outside marriage, because it is against the Will of God (see our Lord's sayings and the Pauline discussions of fornication). It is valid within the context of marriage. The community decides what shall be the conditions under which, for the sake of its future citizens, it shall recognize marriage. But the State does not marry; it merely registers the marriage which has been effected by the exchange of consent between the persons concerned. It follows that the State can no more dissolve a marriage than it can effect one. The traditional Christian doctrine has been that *consent* between the parties, not coitus (*concubitus*), constitutes the status of marriage. But it is consent to *concubitus*, and an unconsummated marriage has been the only kind which the Church has ever been inclined to admit of "dissolution", inasmuch as the one flesh *henosis* effected by coitus is absent.

The association of love's deepest physical expression with the reproductive system now appears to be the Creator's method of guaranteeing those necessities of emotional stability and alternating psychological maternal-paternal influences which a human child must have as it develops. "Be fruitful and multiply and replenish the earth" was said to Adam and Eve. Reproduction is God's blessing on the union of man and woman, articulating the creative nature of their love and providing them with a common task in the pursuit of which their love reaches out beyond the purely physical avenues of expression, so retaining a capacity for further enrichment.

So procreation is seen as an end—or result—of an act which is in itself wholly self-explanatory and self-contained. Procreation does not fulfil the classical definition of an "object", i.e. "The object is that at which the action aims and in which it naturally results, and with the attainment of which it is completed."[1] If coitus is considered when it takes place after the menopause, the inapplicability of this definition to procreation is at once apparent; as also its failure to fulfil the further definition: "the object is that purpose or intention which is inherent

[1] Mortimer, *Elements of Moral Theology*, p. 63.

in the action and characterizes it, whether the agent intends it or no".[1] Procreation—of which conception is the essential preliminary —is clearly not "inherent in the act of coitus". Procreation—or more accurately conception—is a possible result of coitus but not its object. A moral agent must always take responsibility for deciding whether or not certain *results* of an action should be realized. This is the essence of free will (e.g. to decide whether or not the act of inadvertently taking poison shall be allowed to issue in its natural results).

One clear "object", and one alone, is now seen to attach to coitus: union (*henosis*). It has several different purposes or ends. The procreative end is entirely ruled out on certain occasions in the natural order of things, not only after the menopause but during pregnancy, and on those days in the menstrual cycle when there is no ovum present to be fertilized (the "safe period"). The fact that coitus is possible on these occasions for humans, who are not limited like animals to seasonal heats, itself suggests that God intends coitus to be other than procreative. With humans, it is impossible (apart from rape, artificial insemination, or insemination *ab extra*) for procreation to be achieved without the unitive "object" of coitus being at the same time attained, since coitus by itself establishes *henosis*—sustaining and deepening the *henosis* on every repetition.

Coitus establishes (as effective cause and as continuing enrichment) the unity of husband and wife; in due course reproduction *may* follow. That is the natural order. The unitive achievement of sexual intercourse precedes procreation, and is primary in time-sequence as well as in its inner constitutive nature as "object".

Traditional Catholic theology has not always given enough weight to the relational function of coitus, probably because most of those who fashioned medieval doctrine had no personal experience of this function within marriage. Its importance, however, can hardly be over-stated. It is the moment of mutual orgasm which brings to its climax the unitive *experience* of coitus. In the woman there is a small organ, the clitoris, which has no other function than that of sensation directed to orgasm. In the light of the Christian doctrine of creation, the significance of this organ in the divine ordinance must not be overlooked, especially in assessing the unitive purpose of coitus. The orgasm is not a necessary condition of *henosis*, but it represents the fullest personal experience of it.

We are left, then, with the act of coitus which, in its natural functioning, has one "object" in uniting (or deepening the union of) man and woman, and an *occasional* end (among others) of fertilizing the ovum. General recognition in traditional theological circles to-day is given to this truth in the permission for husband and wife to use the "safe period" as a method of birth control, in spite of the fact that Aquinas believed it to be wrong.

Differences of opinion exist in church circles, not so much about the duty of family planning, but about the legitimate ways of pre-

[1] Cp. "Objectum actus moralis dicitur illud, circa quod tendentia voluntatis proxime et primario versatur", *De principiis theologiae moralis*, by H. Noldir and A. Schmitt, S.J., Vol. I, § 70, p. 75. (A Roman Catholic definition.)

venting conception. From what we have said, it appears that the criterion to be applied in judging the legitimacy of any proposed method is this: the method must, in principle at least, make possible mutual orgasm, because such orgasm represents the focus of relational unity in coitus, and relational unity is the "object" of coitus.

Contraception Outside Marriage

Before applying this test to current methods of contraception, a word must be said about their use outside marriage. Their use in such relationships, while no doubt representing *some* degree of responsibility absent from those who have no thought for the possible birth of a child, does not make such sexual relationships right. The necessary association of the act of procreation with the act of union (though not vice versa, as we have seen) is in the natural order. It is the Will of God. And "what God hath joined together, let not man put asunder". It follows that it must be wrong to engage in coitus for its unitive achievement *apart altogether*, in intention, from the procreative purpose. Outside marriage, a couple would be gravely sinning in producing a child for whom there would be no home nor close association with father and mother. It is because such couples are morally bound to disassociate their mutual congress entirely from any idea of procreation and family life that they are morally bound to abstain from unitive intercourse (i.e. intercourse altogether). It follows that it would be also morally wrong for a married couple to enjoy the unitive achievement of coitus intending *never* to have a family (unless a family were morally contra-indicated). *Only in the context of actual or prospective family life* is the use of contraception legitimate. A couple may feel morally bound to wait before procreating children, *but the intention to have a family must be there* (again, saving medical and moral contra-indications). The traditional doctrine is right: procreation is the primary end of marriage, *but this is not the same thing as saying it is the primary end of every act of coitus, or that it is the "object" of coitus.*

Theological Assessment of Birth-control Methods

We are ready now to apply the unitive test to particular types of birth control.

1. *Complete abstention from intercourse:* This wholly breaks down under our test. The marriage is deprived of unitive expression and refreshment in that particular physical act which is the divine ordinance and a means of grace for married couples.

2. *Coitus interruptus:* In so far as this frustrates the orgasm end of coitus for the woman it is neither procreative nor unitive. In a few cases there need not be this frustration, and the unitive end is then achieved. Note that the sin of Onan is irrelevant. His sin was refusal to bring up children to his dead brother and there is no evidence at all that the "spilling of the seed" was then regarded as sin. His death soon after is an example of the tendency in primitive history to explain *post hoc* by *propter hoc.*

3. *Safe period:* The exclusive use of this method in marriage puts the relational and unitive expression of mutual love under the constraint of a factor external to itself—the calendar. When for relational ends coitus is desired by both, it is denied. If the relative uncertainty attached to this method (e.g. during the menopause) creates fear of pregnancy in the mind of the man or woman, the orgasm end may not be achieved.

4. *Coitus reservatus:* This is permitted in the Roman Catholic Church. In principle it represents a method by which through an act of the will the sperm is prevented from making contact with the ovum. The difference between this method and the use of a contraceptive, which performs the same service, is not easy to distinguish, since both involve a volitional act. Aquinas refused to countenance it. Since the object of coitus reservatus is to prevent orgasm in the man, and the method involves uncertainty and nervous tension, it fails to fulfil the criterion of a legitimate method of birth control.

5. *Scientific contraceptives:* In general, it is morally legitimate to use a material agent in order to forward the well-being of man in his personal relations in society (e.g. wearing glasses or deaf aid). If on moral grounds the unitive object of an act of coitus must be achieved without involving the procreative end, then there is nothing in principle wrong in using a material agent, for that agent is forwarding the personal relational factor essential for marriage, and good marriages are essential for society and the welfare of children. But the test of "unitive orgasm" must still be applied in considering the several different types of scientific contraceptive methods now available.

(*a*) *Condom:* In cases where it impairs the experience for the woman, it fails the test. This would be even more true in cases when it leads to "emissio praecox" for the man.

Otherwise it would be legitimate. The use of the condom is condemned by some on the grounds that an act in such circumstances is not "emissio seminis in vas", and is not, therefore, intercourse at all. This doctrine—and the definition of coitus which it implies—belongs to a theory of coitus which we have reason to dismiss as Biblically inadequate and theologically deficient in the place given to the relational or unitive purpose of sexual congress. The theological significance of the hymen as the natural "threshold" of the vagina has been too little considered in discussing what constitutes coitus. For it appears to fulfil no directly *biological* purpose, and suggests that coitus may be more truly described as penetration past the hymen (or its remnant) than as "emissio seminis in vas". The glans tip does not suffer from some of the drawbacks of the condom in respect of orgasm achievement.

(*b*) *Dutch or diaphragm cap:* As a rule the orgasm capacity of the woman is unimpaired. It should be noted that some women, however, cannot happily use this method. When they can, it would be legitimate.

(*c*) *Chemical suppositories:* If their uncertainty as effective contraceptives produces fear and so inhibits orgasm, they will fail the test we give them. Where pregnancy is inadvisable, but not wholly ruled

out on moral grounds, then their use need do nothing to prevent full unitive achievement in orgasm.

(*d*) *Sterilization:* This is ruled out as a contraceptive measure as grave interference with the integrity of bodily functions as such. It could be considered only in default of any other method in cases where reproduction must be completely avoided for life. (For fuller discussion see *Human Sterilisation,* published by the Church of England Moral Welfare Council.) The use of X-rays for temporary sterilization is open to the same moral considerations as is reversible sterilization.

(*e*) *Oral contraceptives:* The possibility that a means may be made generally available by which the release of the ovum from the ovary is inhibited in any given month by an agent taken through the mouth raises some of the same issues as does sterilization. We have here an interference with the actual function of an organ (the ovary), by which the biological processes are prevented from achieving their "object". In principle this method cannot be morally justified if a contraceptive means is available which does not effect a radical inhibition of a physiological function.

Finally, it should be repeated that it is the duty of every married couple to have a family. The exceptions to this fundamental duty will be rare, and based wholly on moral considerations, which include an assessment of medical indications.

We have tried in this analysis to set out the problem of contraception in a way which will invite further discussion and theological elucidation. Hence the somewhat dogmatic method of treatment designed in order that the various issues may stand out sharply.

In proportion as this subject can be discussed free from prejudice, and on sure theological foundations, so will the needs of men and women everywhere be met who at present cry out for guidance in the most personal aspect of their lives. Such discussion is perhaps the most urgently needed *preparatio evangelica* of our day.

HUGH C. WARNER.

Low Mass need not be so Low

THIS article borrows its title from the heading of a chapter in *The Mass of the Future,* by Father Gerald Ellard, a Jesuit and a prominent exponent of the Liturgical Movement in the United States. This Movement in America, as elsewhere, is concerned with promoting truly corporate worship, and much of what Fr Ellard says is relevant, *mutatis mutandis,* and suggestive for our Church of England. We may not find congregations absorbed in the Rosary or in Litanies of the Virgin when they might be attending to the Liturgy, but the same principle is involved when an Anglican "early service" comes to be primarily an act of individual piety. And that is what it is for many, if not most, of our worshippers. The celebrant looking

down the church often hardly sees the faces of the congregation; they are buried in hands or bent low over a book of devotion; each worshipper is wrapped up in a little devotional world of his own. And this is a long way from the conception of Holy Communion in the Bible, the Fathers, or the Book of Common Prayer.

Let it be clearly said, however, that we are not denying or decrying the positive value of the "early service" to the Church of England in the last hundred years. It has not only brought great blessings to multitudes of individuals, but has played a providential part in maintaining weekly sacramental worship almost everywhere through a period when there might have been a catastrophic lapse from it.

Nor is it desired to assert that individualism, of the right sort, is not an essential part of any true religion. Without the believer's faith the Liturgy becomes a mockery. But a new age has new insights and new requirements; to-day it is more clearly seen than in the last few generations that the worship of the Lord's people involves two complementary elements, the corporate and the individual (or personal), and that the two must be kept in balance or reciprocal tension. And it is hardly in doubt on which side the balance needs redressing to-day.

Some will claim of course that a non-communicating sung Mass in the middle of Sunday morning can provide an adequate expression of corporate worship to balance a personal act of Communion at an early service. But, apart from the question whether this is theologically satisfactory, it is certain that only a small and diminishing number of worshippers can or will come nowadays to two Eucharists on a Sunday morning. The Parish Communion is in a different category indeed, but a true Parish Communion is not something that can be introduced without a long period of preparation or acclimatization, except in particularly favourable circumstances. Meanwhile many priests are asking whether we cannot "begin where people are", and make of the "eight o'clock" more of a corporate occasion for the People of God than it commonly is, and that without the aid of music.[1] It is for such as these and their people that the following suggestions are offered; they are meant to apply to (and most of them have been tried out with) an ordinary village congregation, and all of them adhere faithfully to the 1662 Prayer Book, apart from a very few deviations which have both authority and principle behind them. The "eastward position" is assumed throughout, though it is recognized that, when celebration "over the altar" becomes better known, it will be increasingly adopted and will in itself greatly contribute toward a more corporate Eucharist. But for many years the chancels are likely to "remain as they have done in times past", for the simple reason that the length of the English chancel, combined with the Victorian arrangements

[1] The pattern of early Christian worship would have normally included singing; it is the sung Eucharist which is the norm and a said celebration in some sense a "maimed rite" or reduced form of worship. But if we are to "start where people are", we have to acknowledge that for very many churchpeople of the old school singing at the Eucharist is a definite stumbling-block.

for organ and choir, tend to make a celebration *face au peuple* difficult if not impossible.

Let us see then what can be done without waiting for any changes in our Prayer Book or rearrangements of our church furniture, however desirable these may become at a later date. We may in fact regard these proposals in the light of an interim policy of "acclimatization".

A corporate sense in worship is a precious gift of God, not to be generated or stimulated by artificial means. But much of our present "set-up" actually hinders it and we can smooth the way for truly corporate worship by removing some of the obstacles First there is the bad old idea, which dies very hard, that the Eucharist is essentially something "laid on" by the clergy for the laity; this needs to be counteracted by constantly reminding ourselves and others that the people have an active and audible liturgy to perform, which should fully employ their faculties of body, mind and soul, for the whole man is needed for the wholeness of acceptable worship. There is nothing unspiritual in making use of our eyes, nothing specially devout in keeping them closed; and we should note the entrance of the priest with a sense of expectancy at "the drawing-aside of the veil into the Holy Place". There might be difficulties about too drastic a severance of the "synaxis" from the rest of the service, but the people should be able to *see* from the start that a Ministry of the Word takes place before the Ministry of the Sacrament proper. It is therefore a help if the priest when he enters the sanctuary places the sacred vessels not upon the altar but on the credence (unless indeed they are not brought in until later). The Book, on its rest or cushion, is thus the prominent object visible upon the altar during the Ministry of the Word.

And here we may consider for a moment the matter of the priest's "private preparation" before the altar. In an increasing number of churches this is being abandoned, or is said in the sacristy; where it is used, why should not the congregation "dialogue" it with their priest, as often happens nowadays abroad? The "absolution" spoken by the people for their priest is far more meaningful thus than if said by a serving-boy. Indeed the difficulty of obtaining servers for the "eight o'clock" in country parishes (and in some town parishes too) may be a blessing in disguise. It used to be said that a server "represented the congregation", but if the worship is to be truly congregational, does the congregation need to be thus represented?[1]

It goes without saying that we can hardly enter into corporate worship if we do not understand something of the general meaning of the Liturgy and the articulation of its parts. Hence it needs to be

[1] The Prayer Book clearly envisages the priest joining with the people in the general confession. There is much to be said for his coming down to kneel among the congregation as he does this, and it would then be a gain if, before he returns to the altar to give the absolution, the people could pray for him in such words as those in the traditional "priest's preparation", i.e. "Almighty God, have mercy upon thee" etc.

shown that the Ministry of the Word in the Eucharist has a definite pattern. The Commandments (if used, in their full or shortened form) are to be regarded as a setting-forth of the Law, by means of which we are led towards Christ (Gal. 5. 14). The words of "the Apostle" which follow the Collect were originally received, and are to be received to-day, as a message addressed to the local community of the Lord's people gathered together at their principal assembly; they carry us forward to the point at which we are ready to listen to Christ himself in the Holy Gospel,[1] "all standing" to mark our common attention and reverence. The Epistle and Gospel are but fragments of the Word of God to his people; in the Creed is set forth, in miniature, the whole of God's revelation to his people in Christ and the saving acts of the Gospel.

But the pattern is incomplete without a sermon, which is unequivocally ordered in our Prayer Book. The passages which the Church provides for Epistle and Gospel are often by no means clear by themselves; they require expounding and interpreting in the light of the circumstances of the local church. To "fire them off" without this can be rather like putting the Bible into the hands of unlettered persons without any explanation. So the "liturgical sermon", preceded (as the Prayer Book directs) by notices and announcements which concern the common life of the Body of Christ in the parish, has its essential place in the pattern of the Eucharist; without it the rite is "maimed". There is, however, often some resistance on the part of a congregation to the introduction of preaching at a said celebration. Sometimes the objection is that "it lengthens the service", when people are fasting and eager to get home to breakfast; more often it is simply the reluctance of conservatism to be drawn out of its individualistic approach to the Sacrament and reveals the extent to which we have lost sight of the authentic character of the Eucharist. We must be gentle with such attitudes, which soon disappear with patient teaching. In some places a "temporary bridge" has been made by reading an explanation of the Sunday "proper" from Hebert and Allenby's *Pray with the Church*, either at the set place for a sermon or before the beginning of the service.[2]

We pass from the Ministry of the Word to the Ministry of the Sacrament proper. The transition is marked by the placing of the sacred vessels on the Holy Table, and their uncovering preparatory to the Offertory. It is not altogether the fault of the laity that the word "offertory" has come to mean for most of them the collecting

[1] The Epistle may precede the Gospel to-day because it formed an element of the primitive rite (as Lowther Clarke suggests) even before the Gospels were written. The curious custom of kneeling for the reading of the Epistle seems to have arisen from a notion that it was irreverent or incorrect to sit for any part of a said celebration; it is a custom which can have no liturgical justification, and now seems to be dying out.

[2] Ideally the Creed should follow the Sermon, and fulfil the function of expressing the congregation's corporate affirmation of the Faith which has been proclaimed to them in the Scriptures *and the Sermon.*

of money; they have seldom been taught anything different; they may even have been encouraged in the custom of standing until the collector of alms has visited them and then relapsing into a kneeling position and a private world of devotion.

The Prayer Book describes the collection of the alms, together with the saying of the Sentences which are intended to accompany it, as "*beginning* the Offertory"; it is for the people as well as the priest to continue and complete it. Three parts of the Offertory are distinguished in the opening phrases of the Prayer for the Church, (1) "our alms and (2) oblations[1] and . . . (3) these our prayers". It helps to bring out the meaning of the Offertory if members of the congregation bring up not only the alms but the bread[2] and wine, and also slips of paper containing written requests for prayer. The latter can be read out by the priest before he begins the prayer, and then laid on the altar beside the other offerings. Until this prayer is begun, it is fitting for all to remain standing, attentive to what is being done in their name and mindful of the corporate character of the whole action.

Christians of the Anglican obedience are peculiarly wedded to the kneeling posture for anything that seems like prayer; indeed the expression "Let us pray" is in danger of becoming the stock direction for kneeling down. The Prayer Book specifically enjoins kneeling by the people only for the penitential parts (and of course for receiving the Sacrament) and the Blessing. But the standing posture for prayer in church, normal in primitive times, does not come naturally to English Christians. There is, however, an obvious appropriateness in standing to join the praises of "the whole company of Heaven"; and the bidding to lift up our hearts may well be extended to the lifting up of our bodies also. A former generation was accustomed to join vocally with the priest from the words ". . . therefore with angels and archangels . . ." and this custom might be restored with great advantage.

In some churches the people have been encouraged to join with the priest in saying the Prayer for the Church, the "Humble Access", the Prayer of Oblation (whether immediately after the Prayer of Consecration or after the Communion of the People), and the Prayer of Thanksgiving; and it has been claimed (e.g. at St Wilfred's, Leeds) that it fosters a corporate sense as nothing else does. Others may consider that it confuses the proper liturgy of the people with that of the priest.

There is another, if perhaps a smaller, point worth considering

[1] Whatever this denoted for the compilers, we may, for practical purposes, regard "oblations" as referring to the elements of bread and wine.

[2] It is beyond the scope of this article to discuss (as some Roman Catholic journals have done) possibilities of conserving the principle of "one bread, one body" by means of the kind of Eucharistic bread that is used. Individual wafers certainly suggest, as they are a product of, an individualistic conception of the Sacrament, and ordinary bread cut into small cubes does not give us quite what is needed. Perhaps the women's communities, who are the chief manufacturers of altar-bread, might give earnest and imaginative attention to the production of small loaves easily divisible and of varying sizes.

when we are thinking of parts of the liturgy which priest and people say together. At a sung service there is no doubt a good musical reason why the priest should sing the opening phrase of the Creed and the Lord's Prayer by himself, while the choir and people continue at the next phrase. But can this be justified at a said service? Is it not an immense gain liturgically if all can begin "with one mind and one mouth" at the words "I believe" and "Our Father"? To alert minds this presents no great difficulty, and in the case of the Lord's Prayer the preamble in the 1928 book "As our Saviour Christ . . ." (based on the "*Praeceptis salutaribus* . . ." of the Latin rite) gives us just what is needed to bring everyone in together.

But of all the occasions in public worship where the voice of the people should be heard, the saying of AMEN is the most important. This little word, which links the Old Testament to the New, was constantly on the lips of the Lord himself (though, being translated by "verily", it is apt to escape notice for what it is). Justin Martyr in the second century describes it as the enthusiastic response of the people of God to the great prayer of the Eucharist; it can indeed claim a warrant for its use there from St Paul himself (1 Cor. 14. 16). St Jerome declared that the Christians of Rome in the early fifth century uttered "Amen" with such heartiness and unanimity that one might have thought it was a clap of thunder. It has been well called "the acclamation *par excellence* of the priestly people of God". It not only sets the seal of each individual worshipper on the prayer that has just been spoken, but is a manifest token of the community of prayer existing between the celebrant and the people, and between the members of the congregation. How important then that the people should say "Amen" with a full heart and a full voice, for here is a focal point in their proper liturgy. And nowhere is it so important, nowhere so expressive of the priesthood of the laity, as at the end of the Consecration, after the magnificent *coda*, one of the richest prayer-endings of Christendom, ". . . by Whom and with Whom, in the unity of the Holy Ghost, all honour and glory be unto Thee, O Father Almighty, world without end", so clearly calling for a triumphant response from the people.[1]

After the Consecration there should rightly be a deep silence; but there is sometimes an awkward hiatus after the priest's communion, arising from the lack of anything to indicate the moment when the people should begin to approach the altar. In Anglican usage there is no warrant whatsoever for the invitation used by some priests, "Behold the Lamb of God; behold him that taketh away the sins of the world"; indeed considerable objection might justifiably be raised to this formula on other grounds also. A far better way would be to say at this point the "Benedictus qui venit . . ." where it is specially appropriate, as the recent papal directive recognizes in requiring priests of the Latin Communion to recite the Benedictus after the Consecration instead of after the Sanctus.

[1] For this reason, if for no other, one would wish to see "the Prayer of Oblation" joined again to the "Prayer of Consecration", which in the rite of 1662 has no semblance of finality.

In the act of Communion itself there is both a corporate and a personal element; there is the deep significance on the one hand of all kneeling together and receiving the precious gift alike; here we are conscious, as at no other time, of being "one Bread, one Body" in Christ. But on the other hand it is right, as it is almost inevitable, that the personal element should be uppermost at this moment; it is fitting therefore that another "space of silence" should come immediately after the people's Communion. This period is specially suitable for the "ablutions". For although the Prayer Book directs the priest "to consume what remains of the consecrated Elements immediately after the Blessing", there is no doctrinal difference involved in doing so after the last communicant has received, and the Prayer Book rubric was inserted with the intention of securing that none of the consecrated Sacrament should "be carried out of the church". The cleansing of the vessels at the earlier point in the service minimizes delay at the end, where it can be irksome.[1]

Finally, the Blessing, with which the celebrant "lets them depart", should have for the people of God something of the character of a corporate dismissal, a sending forth of the disciples of Christ, who have been with him in the Breaking of the Bread, to prove themselves his witnesses and fellow-workers in the home, the farm, the office, and the factory. Critical onlookers remind us from time to time that Christians who have knelt side by side in church seem often hardly to know each other outside; and here is something that we ought to heed. A French journal of Christian art came out some time ago with the pregnant suggestion that new churches should always be designed with large porches, so that the faithful might have a better opportunity to fraternize with each other and with their clergy as they came away from the Parish Mass on Sundays. The same kind of opportunity for expressing our *koinonia*, the same kind of prophylactic against Christian isolationism, can be provided by a parish breakfast, which can equally well be associated with a said celebration as with a Parish Communion properly so called. But some of the barriers to fellowship can undoubtedly be undermined by simple expedients, such as those suggested earlier, within the action of the Liturgy itself. If Low Mass were not so low, the whole temperature of Church life would be raised from its all-too-frequent subnormal level.

KENNETH PACKARD.

Structure and Plot in St Matthew's Gospel[2]

I WANT to draw your attention to the distinction between the *structure* of the Gospel according to St Matthew, and its *plot*. By *structure* I mean the division and arrangement of the material into

[1] In the case of celebration "over the altar" priests are often finding it preferable to transfer this necessary but sometimes unedifying action to the sacristy.

[2] A paper read at the *Theology and Ministry* Convention, Oxford, 16 September 1953.

sections; by *plot* I mean the development of the story, and of the relationships involved in the story, from the beginning of the book to the end.

The *structure* of Matthew was recognized certainly at the end of the nineteenth century, by Sir John Hawkins. Hawkins drew attention to the five large collections of the words of Jesus, each section ending with the formula "and it came to pass, when Jesus ended [these words] . . ." (7. 28; 11. 1; 13. 53; 19. 1; 26. 1) (*Horae Synopticae*, 1899, p. 132). B. W. Bacon pointed out further that each section of teaching is preceded by a section of narrative, and that the narrative in each case leads up to the teaching. Thus the whole of Matthew may be divided into five books, with a Preamble and an Epilogue (*The Expositor*, VIII, 85, January 1918, p. 64; *Studies in Matthew*, 1930). The divisions are as follows:

The Preamble,	Chapters	1, 2	The Infancy
Book I	,,	3–7	Discipleship
,, II	,,	8–10	Apostleship
,, III	,,	11–13	The Hiding of the Revelation
,, IV	,,	14–18	Church Administration
,, V	,,	19–25	The Judgment
The Epilogue	,,	26–8	The Passion and Resurrection

This structure was accepted, for example, in Canon Green's commentary in *The Clarendon Bible* (1936); in Dr Kilpatrick's book, *The Origins of the Gospel according to St Matthew* (1946); and in Mr Cox's commentary in *The Torch* series, published in 1952.

I do not wish to suggest that this structure is imaginary; it is clearly there in the Gospel according to St Matthew. I do wish to suggest that we should not place too much emphasis upon it. If we do place too much emphasis upon this structure, then two results follow: First, we look at each book as complete in itself, and disregard its relationship to what has gone before and what follows after. Second, we relegate the account of the passion and resurrection to the status of an epilogue; and this, I believe, is unjust to the Christian faith of the author of this Gospel. For although he certainly laid great stress on the words of Jesus, and may have felt Mark to be inadequate because it contained so little of Christ's teaching, nevertheless he did not think of the death and resurrection of the King of the Jews as an epilogue—an appendage added on to what had gone before. Like Mark, Matthew has tied the account of the passion on to the account of the ministry, by means of Christ's predictions of suffering and resurrection.

Our appreciation of the structure and arrangement of this Gospel must not blind us to its plot: that is, to the development of the story which runs right through from chapter 1 to chapter 28.

Perhaps this plot can best be seen if we consider the relationship of Jesus to the Jews, as Matthew sets it out.

Notice first that the twelve apostles were sent to Israel, and to Israel alone, in chapter 10: "Go not into any way of the Gentiles, and enter not into any city of the Samaritans: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (10. 5b, 6). With this, compare the

saying, which Matthew has added to Mark's story, in Christ's words to the Canaanitish woman in chapter 15: "I was not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (15. 24). And with these, contrast the prophecy in 24. 14: "And this gospel of the kingdom shall be preached to the whole world for a testimony unto all the nations" (*πᾶσιν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν*); and the words to the eleven after the resurrection, in chapter 28: "Go ye therefore, and make disciples of all the nations" (*πάντα τὰ ἔθνη*, i.e. all the Gentiles—28. 19).

Why to Israel alone in chapters 10 and 15, but to all the Gentiles in chapters 24 and 28? If we say that the evangelist used different and contradictory sources, are we not attributing to him a very low level of intelligence? I suggest, following Dr Lightfoot (*History and Interpretation in the Gospels*, 1935, pp. 191 ff.), that the explanation of the apparent contradiction is this: the plot has developed between chapters 10 and 15 on the one hand, and chapters 24 and 28 on the other hand. And that the idea here is that the gospel has been offered to the Jews by Jesus, and that the majority of them have rejected it; therefore the gospel is now sent to the Gentiles.

This theme is familiar to us from other places in the New Testament: for example, John 12, Acts 28 and Romans 9–11.

Moreover, this is a theme of which Matthew himself is clearly aware. He gives us this saying of Jesus: "Many shall come from the east and the west, and shall sit down with Abraham, and Isaac, and Jacob, in the kingdom of heaven: but the sons of the kingdom shall be cast forth into outer darkness: there shall be the weeping and gnashing of teeth" (8. 11, 12). The context of these words is the healing of the centurion's servant, and that context shows that Matthew understood the "many from the east and the west" as the Gentiles; and "the sons of the kingdom" as the Jews.

Again, Matthew adds this saying to the Marcan parable of the wicked husbandmen: "Therefore I say unto you, the kingdom of God shall be taken away from you, and shall be given unto a nation bringing forth the fruits thereof" (21, 43). And here, too, "you" means the representatives of the Jews.

The plot of Matthew's Gospel, in so far as the Jews and Gentiles are concerned, could perhaps be summarized as follows:

Jesus proclaimed the gospel, by word in the Sermon on the Mount; and by deed in the ten miracles of chapters 8 and 9. He sent the Twelve to Israel to carry on his work, that is, to preach and to heal (chapter 10). Israel did not accept the gospel; it was hidden from them (chapters 11 to 13); as Isaiah had said:

> "This people's heart is waxed gross
> And their ears are dull of hearing,
> and their eyes have they closed" (13. 14 ff.).

Jesus therefore founded the church, and gave instructions concerning church matters (chapters 14 to 18). He further gave warning of the judgment coming upon the scribes and Pharisees (chapter 23), and upon the whole world (chapters 24, 25). Then the final act was performed: the Jews delivered their king to Pilate, and demanded

his crucifixion, and said, "His blood be on us, and on our children" (27. 25). But God reversed their act, and raised Jesus from the dead; and the gospel was sent out to all the nations (chapter 28).

In the light of this, the story of the unclean spirit, in chapter 12, as Matthew understood it, becomes clear. The man from whom the unclean spirit has gone out stands for Judaism; for the preaching and healing of Jesus, directed to Judaism, have cast out that spirit. But the Jews have not accepted the gospel; therefore the unclean spirit returns, finds his house swept and garnished, and brings in seven other spirits more evil than himself. "The last state of that man becometh worse than the first. Even so shall it be also unto this evil generation" (12. 43–5). Judaism was possessed: was healed by the coming of Jesus to save his people from their sins (1. 21): but rejected its king, and so brought worse evil upon itself.

Perhaps we can see further that the Infancy stories in Matthew prefigure this plot in the rest of the Gospel. Jesus is born of the line of Abraham, in the city of David. He is rejected by King Herod but worshipped by the Gentile Magi. He is taken away into Egypt, and on his return he settles not in Judaea but in Galilee, Galilee of the Gentiles, as we find a few pages further on (4. 15). Again rejection by the Jews leads on to the opening of the gospel to the Gentiles.

To sum up. I believe that we can easily be misled by Matthew's clear arrangement of his material into regarding each division or book as complete in itself—five stills, as the film industry says. Whereas these sections are not complete in themselves, but contain a continuous plot, an action which develops as we read on, and is not complete until the book has been finished.

If this is so, then a practical conclusion will follow. When we wish to find out the meaning of a particular passage in Matthew, in meditation or for preaching, we should not consider it in isolation from the rest of the Gospel, but in its context and setting within the whole action. We should ask, Why did Matthew put this passage here? What can we learn of its meaning, from its position? This may help us to meditate upon and to preach the gospel, rather than our own ideas.

J. C. Fenton.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS

Mr Feibusch is an artist. Examples of his own mural paintings can be seen in St John's Church, Waterloo Road, London, and in Chichester Cathedral.

The Rev. Hugh C. Warner is Education Secretary of the C. of E. Moral Welfare Council and an honorary canon of Guildford Cathedral.

The Rev. K. G. Packard is Rector of Fenny Compton.

The Rev. J. C. Fenton is Sub-Warden of Lincoln Theological College.

CORRESPONDENCE

MINISTERIUM VERBI DIVINI

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

Many readers will have great sympathy for the Archdeacon of Durham's plea in your November issue for more theology at the university. But is there not a need not only to make this possible in the university but to go even further back to the school?

In my capacity as Governor of a Grammar School I have before me the academic record of its pupils. It is distinguished and illuminating. It covers the year 1952–53. During the year forty-four boys passed in sufficient subjects to secure entrance to a university and seventeen in fact have gone up this term for the first time. Among these are eight with a State scholarship. The subjects which carry these boys to the universities should be noted. Seven out of the eight State scholarships are in Natural Science: one is in modern languages. The forty-four boys between them have passed, at the advanced level of the G.C.E. in 124 papers. Of these there are none in Greek, none in Ancient History, and only nine in Latin. Mathematics, physics and chemistry have a wholesale predominance. Here is a successful Grammar School whose headmaster is fully aware of the dangers of an excessively scientific curriculum, and yet not one of these university candidates is qualified to begin the kind of intellectual discipline demanded by a good degree in Theology.

Yours, etc.,

HOLY TRINITY VICARAGE,
BOURNEMOUTH.

FREDERICK BUSSBY.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

I am grateful for the Archdeacon of Durham's article in your November issue. It says clearly things which I have vaguely felt and thought for some time and which have become clearer in discussion with others.

I am one of those who were advised by a C.A.C.T.M. selector not to read theology for a degree; and an experienced parish priest told me recently that he had similarly advised someone seeking ordination.

I duly began to read for the English Tripos at Cambridge. I have always been grateful that at the end of the first year Providence and a shaky Third combined to switch me over to theology, which I read under the expert guidance of the late Dr Wilfred Knox, a great scholar and an inspiring teacher. I was an ex-Service ordinand, new in the Christian faith, knowing hardly anything about the Bible, and it was a tremendous help, both intellectually and devotionally, to have this solid foundation.

But, personal reasons apart, I think it is more even than that we need training in the subject-matter of our profession, though we certainly need that. I think the lasting value of reading theology is that it helps us to understand more of the greatness and reality of God and to know that our feet are set in a large, solidly built room where many have been before. This is such a great help that it is hard to understand that anyone would willingly forego it. I know that, humanly speaking, I should have been far less effective in my short ministry so far, without it.

Those who put us off studying theology from the beginning would be right if one could only get some afterwards. But that is just the trouble! We don't "get theology for the rest of our lives". Soon after we go into parishes, it becomes a real effort to find time to learn anything more about anything. We simply get endless demands, in preaching and pastoral work, for the application of a theology we have never been able to learn. And that is a burden grievous to be borne.

Yours faithfully,

CLERICUS MINIMUS.

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

Many readers must share Archdeacon Cobham's concern that a far higher percentage of ordinands should read Theology at a university. But is there not also a need that many more men should devote themselves to those specialized studies necessary to a full understanding of the Old Testament?

It will hardly be challenged to-day that no understanding of the New Testament is possible without a knowledge of the Old. Yet a full knowledge of the Old Testament and its ways of thought is available only to those who are at home in the Hebrew language.

It is unnecessary to draw attention to the dearth of Old Testament scholarship not only among the parochial clergy but even among Anglican full-time teachers of Theology. This can be partly remedied by the study of Hebrew at a theological college or, rather better, by reading it as one subject in a Theology or General Arts degree. But there is undoubtedly also a need for more men, including those whose call is primarily to a pastoral and not an academic ministry, to read Honours Hebrew.

There are at least two reasons why more ordinands do not read Hebrew. First, it is mistakenly supposed to be a superhuman task to come to a university with no knowledge of Hebrew and yet to reach degree standard. Secondly, it is not yet generally realized that in England Hebrew Honours can be read not only at Oxford and Cambridge but also in the younger but very vigorous Oriental Departments at London, Manchester, Leeds and Durham.

Yours faithfully,

SCHOOL OF ORIENTAL STUDIES,
DURHAM.

J. A. EMERTON.

BULTMANN *v.* AQUINAS

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

SIR,

If we place Bultmann's definition of myth as "*a mode of thinking in which the divine appears as human and the other-worldly as this worldly*" (Ian Henderson, *Myth in the New Testament*, S.C.M. Press) beside the statement of Thomas Aquinas, "*Divine things are not named by our intellect as they really are in themselves, for in that way it knows them not, but they are named in a way that is borrowed from created things*", we have perhaps a key to part of the "Entmythologisierung" controversy. On the side of Aquinas we might add Martin Buber's assertion that if we say we believe that "He" is we speak in metaphor, "Thou" alone being possible of God. Abbé de Tourville's comment, "acts of devotion . . . are only patterns, superimposed . . ." is also to the point.

Such patterns we accept in all our thinking; our danger lies in mistaking the pattern for the reality. Scientific knowledge, for example, we express in mathematical formulas which we project on to the world of things (as we lay the grid of latitude and longitude lines on the earth to make position ascertainable), but we recognize that the expression is not the reality being as much a thought-form as is a myth. Music we express in sound, but it could be demythologized into mathematics just as a painting by Rembrandt might be expressed in ratios of colour and form. A poet may tell the story of the Sleeping Beauty or reduce it to a statement of the doctrines of original sin and prevenient grace, but in such processes we lose the actuality, the music, the art, the fairy-tale.

So when we come to attempt to describe the relations between transcendent Being and our created selves we use the metaphor "Father", and to describe the inexplicable relationship within the Deity we add "Son" and "Spirit". Demythologized the idea baffles, remythologized in a formula surely puts it out of our reach altogether. We, the ordinary lay people, need for our thinking the basic human facts of birth, death, suffering, love, lived out in a family on earth and re-enacted in the sacraments, as a "mythology" casting its pattern on the immutable and eternal. How otherwise can we think of "God" at all?

Aquinas's acceptance of our limitations in the phrase "in that way it (our intellect) knows them not", but "in a way that is borrowed", and perhaps a more profound study of the mind's use of imagery in science, in poetry, in myth, and in dreams, need to find a place not yet assigned to them in this controversy.

Yours faithfully,

GRACE A. WOOD.

THE SHANTY,
GELT ROAD,
BRAMPTON, CUMBERLAND.

A PROPOSED PRAYER BOOK

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

G. J. Cuming's review of the proposed Prayer Book for the Church of India, Pakistan, Burma, and Ceylon, acknowledges that it covers only a few of the additions and alterations which make it unique amongst the books of the Anglican Communion, but it seems to me unfortunate that he omits mentioning a feature that is not only one of the most striking innovations in an Anglican Book, but also meets a need that some of us have felt for years, namely the section of the Propers headed "The Commemoration of Departed Christians". Four Collects, Epistles and Gospels are provided, and a subsidiary Calendar names the days upon which they may be used for the commemoration of the death or martyrdom of certain outstanding Christians in the Churches who will use the Book, the landing of the first missionaries in modern times, and the consecration of pioneer Bishops. In the collects God is thanked for the sacrifice, constancy, or zeal, of the person remembered, and we pray that we may be inspired to follow his example.

This seems to me an admirable modern expression of the primitive way of adding to the Church's calendar of Saints. The outstanding Christian is remembered at first without argument as to his or her status in the after life, and if in time the Church is convinced of the sanctity of the person commemorated, and the cultus is healthy, it would be within the competence of the Church to shift the name from the roll of Departed Christians to that of the recognized Saints.

Yours truly,

BASIL MINCHIN.

BEDMINSTER VICARAGE,
BRISTOL, 3.

EPISCOPAL SIGNATURES

To the Editor of THEOLOGY.

DEAR SIR,

A curiosity amongst episcopal signatures was that of Lord George Murray, Bishop of Rochester in the last century, when one of his sons was rector of this parish. He came over to baptize a grandchild and the signature in the register is "George 'Rochester' ". Did the quotation marks indicate his sense of distinctness from the temporal peer of that name?

To add a question: what is the origin of the familiar colon after the signature of some bishops? To signify a contraction? But Laud signed himself "William Cant." with a plain full-stop after the contraction.

Yours truly,

J. R. LUMB.

CHISLEHURST RECTORY,
KENT.

BOOK REVIEWS

PETER—DISCIPLE, APOSTLE, MARTYR. By Oscar Cullmann. S.C.M. Press. 18s.

The S.C.M. Press is to be congratulated on publishing with commendable promptitude, and in an English translation which is generally readable even if occasionally a trifle angular, a book which will doubtless remain the standard Protestant treatment of its subject for many years to come. With the penetrating scholarship and lucid presentation we have come to expect of him, Dr Cullmann deals first with the historical career of the Apostle Peter, and then with the exegetical and theological problems connected with Matt. 16. 17–19.

As *disciple*, Peter was not yet the leader but only the spokesman of the other disciples *vis-à-vis* their Master. The Gospels eschew any attempt to read back into the lifetime of Jesus that primacy over against the other disciples which Peter enjoyed as apostle after the Resurrection, a fact which points to the reliability of the Gospel portrait.

As *apostle*, Peter appears in the period immediately after the death of Jesus as the leader of the earliest Church at Jerusalem and thereby for the time being of the universal Church. When he left Jerusalem, however, he was never afterwards the leader of any Church, but the leading field worker in the Jewish Christian mission. An examination of Peter's theology (1 Peter is left aside as being of doubtful authenticity) shows that he stood nearer to Paul than to James, the Lord's brother (contrast Lietzmann and cp. Streeter). Peter was a universalist, and his doctrine of Christ was a "paedology", which implies that he attached a redemptive significance to Christ's death. To the reviewer this account of Peter's doctrine of Christ seems incomplete. Acts 2. 36 indicates that while the earliest Church interpreted the *earthly* life of Jesus in terms of the Isaianic *pais*, it held that at his *exaltation* Jesus was inaugurated as *Kyrios* (*Maran*) and *Christos* (*Mashiah*).

Was Peter a *martyr*, and, if so, did he die at Rome? An exhaustive analysis of the literary, liturgical and archaeological evidence leaves us with John 21. 18 as the only certain proof of the fact of Peter's martyrdom, while 1 Clem. 5 (the treatment of this passage is masterly) strongly suggests that it did occur at Rome. So far, however, from being the founder of the Roman Church, Peter probably arrived there only at the end of his life. 1 Clem. 5 hints that he may have come to deal with certain tensions in the Christian community, the same tensions which caused, or at any rate aggravated, Paul's Roman imprisonment. Here Dr Cullmann calls attention to remarkable affinities of language between 1 Clem. 5 and Phil. 1 in a way which throws considerable doubt on Duncan's Ephesian hypothesis recently championed by Synge. A fascinating, and for the English public the first exhaustive, account of the recent excavations under St Peter's Church on the Vatican leads Dr Cullmann to the cautious, if somewhat disappointing, conclusion that Peter's grave has certainly not

been found, though the investigation has made it tolerably certain that Peter was executed in the Vatican district.

Had Peter's presence at Rome any theological significance? This can be answered only by an exegetical and theological consideration of Matt. 16. 17–19. Readers of Dr Lowther Clarke's *Divine Humanity*, 1936, 151 ff., will recall how on the Continent a reaction set in between the wars in favour of the authenticity of this saying. They will now learn that since 1941 the pendulum has swung back again, and the question is once more in a state of flux. Hence Dr Cullmann devotes a good deal of space to vindicating anew the authenticity of the saying, bringing forward a number of new arguments. He argues that the saying forms an isolated piece of tradition, wrongly and inappropriately inserted by Matthew into the Markan account of Caesarea Philippi, and, he conjectures, uttered originally at the Last Supper, like the saying of similar import at Luke 22. 31–34. The traditional Protestant exegesis that the Rock on which the Church is to be built is rejected in favour of the Catholic exegesis that the Rock is Peter himself. The saying implies that the Ecclesia will belong to the interval between the Resurrection and the Parousia, for while the gates of Hades (i.e. the power of death) still exist, a limit has been set to their power. An examination of further sayings of Jesus shows that while he regarded his death as the decisive event which would bring the Parousia in its train, he nevertheless envisaged an interval between the two events, an interval characterized by the existence and activity of the community which would be the immediate outcome of his redemptive work.

The concluding section deals with the theological problem of Matt. 16. 17–19. While accepting the Catholic exegesis of the Rock, Dr Cullmann vigorously contests the Roman assumption that Peter can have successors in that capacity. As the historical examination had already suggested, Peter's function as the Rock belongs exclusively to the earliest period of Church history. After that the foundation has been laid, and the later Church must see that it continues to build upon that foundation. The foundation however belongs to the *ephapax* of the redemptive events. Only the power of the keys and of binding and loosing continues to be exercised in the ongoing life of the Church. Dr Cullmann however supposes that with the death of the apostles these other powers reverted to the Church at large, which was thus free to create its own ministerial organs (cp. T. W. Manson, *The Church's Ministry*). Even if they do not agree with everything in *The Apostolic Ministry* (which Dr Cullmann unfortunately, though perhaps pardonably, mistakes for "*the* Anglican standpoint"!), most Anglicans would demur here. Is it an intelligible interpretation of the development of the Church's ministry to suppose that a period of apostolic government was succeeded by democratic and congregational order, to be followed by monarchical episcopacy later? The "tunnel" period is of course a free field for tentative hypotheses, but the Manson-Cullmann view is pure conjecture, and there is at any rate some evidence (2 Tim. 2. 2 and 1 Clem. 44) to suggest that precisely during the tunnel period the

view was held that the apostles had taken steps to provide officers to continue such apostolic functions as were alienable. And since the Word of God stands over the Church, and is not an immanent possession within it, it is surely more appropriate that the ministry which bears that Word should also come to the Church "from above" in due succession from the eyewitnesses and first ministers of the Word. The problem of the ministry is the problem of the nature of the Word of God.

LAMPETER. REGINALD H. FULLER.

THE MEANING OF EXISTENCE. A Metaphysical Enquiry. By Dom Mark Pontifex and Dom Illtyd Trethowan. Longmans. 12s. 6d.

This work is divided into two parts; the first, by Dom Mark Pontifex, comprises of six chapters; the second, by Dom Illtyd Trethowan, is briefer and contains four chapters. The outlook of the authors may be described as Augustinian, and whilst they are anxious to point out the affinities of their position with that of current Thomist writers, nevertheless their criticisms of the latter are acute and significant. Dom Illtyd maintains that neo-scholastic writers have to some extent operated with false abstractions and misleading generalizations. It is to be doubted whether the present volume is altogether blameless in this respect. In fact, Dom Illtyd believes that it would have been better had Dom Mark sought to develop his theory without the help of the concept of "potency". This raises the question of the value of the Aristotelian epistemology as a whole to the Christian apologist. It is to be hoped that the authors will deal more fully with this much avoided topic, and so place us further in their debt.

The crux of the argument is to be found in Dom Mark's analysis of the concept of "existence", and in Dom Illtyd's treatment of the problem of God's existence. Dom Mark presents a "double-notion" view of existence, and argues that the term refers both to the limited (i.e. to creatures) and to the unlimited (i.e. to God). Indeed the limited is found at one end of a relation, and the unlimited at the other. The relation is said to be unique, and hence it can only be described analogically. It follows that our knowledge that God exists cannot be entirely inferential. The function of analogy is to help us to describe the nature of God, not to establish God's existence. There must therefore be some sort of apprehension of God. But what sort of knowledge can this be? The problem is difficult, and I do not find that the authors have succeeded in clarifying this point. We are clearly told that we must avoid "ontologism". For we are aware of the infinite only "in a confused and implicit way". Our knowledge of God is said not to be *direct* as is our knowledge of hard surfaces, "for it is only in his actions on things, and in our own souls in particular, that we know him". It would have been an advantage if we had been given a definition (with more examples) of what "indirect" here means. One possible definition is considered on page

145, where knowledge based on testimony is said to be "indirect". But that definition is said to be inapplicable because valid testimony presupposes previous "direct" experience at some point.

The writers desire to avoid the Scylla of claiming that our knowledge of God is purely inferential. Before they can claim to have avoided the Charybdis of ontologism, it will be necessary to provide more detailed analyses of the concept of an "experience" of God, and of "ontologism", than the writers have done. Perhaps the distinction between an awareness which is clear and one which is confused will then be found to be of more use than the distinction between an awareness which is direct and one which is indirect.

There are two separate discussions of the Ontological Argument, in which the authors contrive to say something fresh about a topic on which so much has been written.

To sum up. This is an interesting book which stimulates and provokes. It does not solve all the problems which perplex the modern apologist. But it does show him what those problems are, and why they are difficult.

Lampeter. Ronald Tree.

Christian Faith and Communist Faith. A Series of studies by Members of the Anglican Communion. Edited by D. M. Mackinnon. Macmillan. 21s.

Many books on the subject of Christianity and Communism have been palpably dishonest. This is an honest book and merits honest study. No Communist would regard its chapters on Marxism, Leninism, Stalinism, as in any way adequate, but the book is a more detailed imaginative attempt to survey the subject than any that has appeared before. It lacks the note of understanding contributed by Dr Needham and Professor Macmurray to *Christianity and the Social Revolution* nearly twenty years ago, and something of the hard-bitten quality of Tiran Nersoyan's *Christian Approach to Communism*. It lacks the affirmative spirit of Paul Tillich's discussion of Marxism in *The Protestant Era*.

Nevertheless, it gives due weight to the vastness of the problem, reminding us that "we are not dealing with a set of opinions which Marx held on this subject or on that, but with a world picture and a life-wisdom which commands not merely men's assent but their allegiance". Another set of men has arrived who give the impression that they are turning the world upside down! Is the world then so rightside up that Christians should leap to its defence? The genesis of this militant faith is not adequately described, but Dr Robinson in his fine essay on the Christian Hope points out that "Communist eschatology was able to fire wills and imaginations of men chiefly because the Christian Church had defaulted in its hope", and rightly insists on the seriousness of history for Communist and Christian alike. This strikes a truer note of understanding than that which the Bishop of Chichester contributes in the Introduction, where it is

implied that our fellow Christians in "Communist" lands have largely been taken in by skilful deployment by Communists of ecclesiastical divisions, or that which finds illustration in references to *The God that failed* and the novels of Mr Koestler. Phrases like "The relentless liquidation of landlords and prelates", to be taken seriously, demand documentation. It is possible, as a result of public trials, to say what has happened to certain prelates, and why.

The complaint that "Marxists assume that they have uncovered a sort of secret machinery which drives the social process" is repeated. But presumably there is a drive in the social process (and Dr Toynbee has devoted much of his vast erudition to the elucidation of it) to be investigated, presumably it is better to understand the drive than to try to ignore it, and on page 97 we find Mr Foster declaring that "there is no mystery that will ultimately resist disclosure". One feels that the images of machinery and clockwork—not Marxist anyway—have got the better of their writers. Mechanistic materialism is not Marxist materialism.

Many Christians, writing on Communism, are fearfully on the defensive. Professor Hughes in his essay on "The Christian Conception of Social Justice" is wholesomely ready to point out some basically Christian elements in the Marxist conception as well as to note points of divergence, and to warn us quite usefully against "making shudders do duty for thought". It is important too that we should remind ourselves that "*our* faith is shown by our works alone", since the book refers from time to time to Communist works, with a questionable refrain that these have disillusioned their one-time supporters. It is a pity that no effort is made to deal in greater detail with what is happening in the Peoples' Democracies, the U.S.S.R. and People's China, with their immensely different problems and lines of action, and a very great pity indeed that none of the writers in this volume seems to be acquainted with the additions to the "faith" which Chinese experience has already contributed. It may well be that British people will learn more understanding of Communism from the new China than from anywhere else and attention should be paid to it. Stalinism is not the last word of Communism, and no Marxist believes it is.

Mr Crombie suggests that the real problem is that of tyranny, that a form of socialism might at a push be tolerable, but that this police tyranny is the insuperable objection. Communists, it would seem, are coldly unmoved by it. Yet it was the cruelty of Capitalism which moved Marx to fury, and it is the cruelty of Capitalist Imperialism in Kenya, South Africa, Malaya, Guiana, which impresses the underdog to-day. It would have been better if each of the writers in this book had tried to see through the eyes of the least of these our brethren and to understand why Paul Robeson should say that it was not until he went to Moscow that he knew the dignity of a human being. The keynote of popular expression in the Peoples' Democracies and China is "Liberation". This can be unintelligible to a master race.

Equally important is it for Anglicans who read this book to try to

see the matter through the eyes of men like Dr Hromadka, whose statement at Lund on the "prophetic 'Yes' " could hardly be regarded as lip-service to the police-state, or Dr Y. T. Wu in his insistence on Reformation in the Church in China. One can be grateful again to Professor Hughes for reminding us that "when we overcome the tendency to equate the redemptive work of Christ with the personal influence of those who call themselves followers of Jesus of Nazareth", "we shall be more ready to discern the working out of that redemption in places where we do not usually expect to find it".

SHEFFIELD. ALAN ECCLESTONE.

LETTERS AND PAPERS FROM PRISON. By Dietrich Bonhoeffer. Edited by Eberhard Bethge. Translated by Reginald H. Fuller. S.C.M. Press. 12s. 6d.

This is one of those rare books which, like Pascal's *Pensées*, invite the reader to share the intimate thoughts and experiences of one of the saints and martyrs of the Christian Church. Dietrich Bonhoeffer combined in himself uniquely the cross-currents of the modern world. Heir of the great liberal tradition of Harnack, Seeberg, and Lietzmann, his teachers, he preserved its values as a follower of Karl Barth. Child of the German aristocracy, of whose culture his life was filled, he was one of its strongest links to the Anglo-Saxon world. Product and defender of bourgeois life and values, he was their profoundest critic and renewer. With heart and soul a lover of this world—its nature, its people, its art and music, its achievements, and its hopes—he found in a martyr's death God's fulfilment of all these things.

It is the story of these themes which this book tells. The core of the book is letters written during Bonhoeffer's last imprisonment to his most intimate friends and family. He was forced to sit, reflect, and write, to watch the history which he had formerly helped to form. He was pulled from the midst of a vigorous life—as a churchman and theological professor, as politician and member of the underground movement which planned the 1944 attempt on Hitler's life, as an international contact for the German Confessing Church, and as an apologist for the Christian faith in a non-Christian environment. These letters therefore vibrate with participation in the events and the cuture from which he was cut off, deepened by the opportunity for intense personal worship, study, and reflection. The world was present to Bonhoeffer in his cell, only less present than God himself. Therefore this book is germinal in the most exciting sense. It contains the seeds, the saplings, and spring blossoms, of new ways of thought and action for the Christian Church which may yet transform its witness and its theology. Bonhoeffer would probably have become Germany's greatest theologian had he lived. He would certainly have become its most revolutionary.

The central theme of these letters, poems, and reflections, is the

way of a Christian and of the Church, in this world and for this world.

> "What *is* Christianity, and indeed what *is* Christ for us to-day? The time when men could be told everything by means of words, whether theological or simply pious, is over, and so is the time of inwardness and conscience, which is to say the time of religion as such."

By "religion" Bonhoeffer means metaphysics, which create a realm of experience and certain presuppositions about life which are not relevant to the experience of modern man. Modern man is no longer concerned about his salvation, in an individual sense. God has become less and less necessary as a working hypothesis for his thinking and life. The world has become mature without God. It has emancipated itself from a feeling of dependent tutelage.

What is Christ for this world? Bonhoeffer rejects the answer which he variously calls methodist, pietist, or liberal-apologetic. This would try to prove to the world that it is after all not so mature as it imagines. It would drive men to think of the extreme boundaries of their lives—of death and destruction. It would "fall upon one or two unhappy people in their weakest moment and force them by a kind of religious coercion". It would, like the psycho-therapists, persuade men "that their happiness is really damnation, their health sickness, their vigour and vitality despair". It would try to clear a religious area in life where God may still reign, or force man back into a religious state of mind. Against all this Bonhoeffer sets the way of Christ in the world, which is non-religious-worldly in the true sense:

> "What do we mean by God? Not in the first place an abstract belief in his omnipotence, etc. That is not a genuine experience of God, but a partial extension of the world. Encounter with Jesus Christ, implying a complete orientation of human being in the experience of Jesus as one whose only concern is for others. This "being there for others" of Jesus the experience of transcendence. The freedom from self, maintained to the point of death, the sole ground of his omnipotence, omniscience, and ubiquity. Faith is participation in the Being of Jesus (incarnation, cross, and resurrection)."

So runs the outline of a chapter in a book he had planned. Bonhoeffer pleads for this participation in the world, as a man-for-others, as a human being *per se*, whose humanity in its fullness is from Christ. He points the way toward a "non-religious interpretation of Biblical concepts", and a new form of Church life. These themes remain mere promises of what they might have become in his hands. But he has left to posterity a prospectus and a sense of direction, which may well lead us beyond the conflicts of Barthian and liberal theology, and beyond the estrangement of Church and world.

But theology is not the dominant mood of these letters—rather reflection on the broad range of human experience. One of Bonhoeffer's deepest inner crises was his spiritual orientation to his own death, and its relation to his path in life. He had consistently chosen the way of probable death—in giving himself wholly to the Confessing Church, in returning from America on the eve of war, in participating in the Resistance, and in refusing to escape from prison because of the danger he might have brought to others—in the line

of duty. His soul was one which sought the disciplined chaste pleasures and despised vulgarity and abandon. But he loved the world—the bourgeois cultured moral world—in which he lived. He hoped for its renewal in faith and he affirmed its values. We find him living over again the joys of the music, the art, the literature, the friendships and family life which he knew, and striving to the end with the pain of being without them. We find him hoping to the end, for the success of the resistance, for another meeting with his friends, for the full, the worldly, blessing of God. There is sensitive guidance in his writing for a couple at their wedding, for mothers-in-law, for his friend and wife in their times of separation. All this is fulfilled, not annulled, by the final dictum which Bonhoeffer passed on his own martyrdom: "Death is the supreme festival on the road to freedom".

New York. Charles C. West.

Coverdale and His Bibles. By J. F. Mozley. Lutterworth Press. 27s. 6d.

Miles Coverdale, although as he himself acknowledged a translator of translations, yet shares with William Tyndale the honour of being one of the two principal architects of the English Bible, not only because his was the first complete Bible to be printed in English, but also because of the literary merit of his work, familiar to every Anglican in the Prayer Book version of the Psalter, and of even greater importance for its contribution to the language of the Authorized Version.

Like that of so many great men, the story of Coverdale's life contains many gaps, and this has perhaps deterred would-be biographers, for the last full-length study of Coverdale appears to have been published no less than 115 years ago. Apart from short introductions to his works and dictionary articles, there seems to be nothing later. Dr Mozley's work therefore fills a very much neglected gap in the annals of the English Reformation, and his introductory sketch of the life, although it contains only twenty-eight pages, is the most complete account available.

This is filled out in the very much larger second part of the book, which deals with the various versions of the Bible issued between 1530 and 1539 in which Coverdale was concerned. Dr Mozley deals briefly with the two translations of the Psalter and the Latin-English New Testament, and in detail with Coverdale's own Bible of 1535, Matthew's Bible of 1537 which adopted Coverdale's translation for the books from Ezra to Malachi, and the officially commissioned Great Bible of 1539 of which Coverdale was the principal editor. To each of these Bibles the author devotes three sections, the first telling the story of its translation, the second examining the debt of the translator to his various sources and considering the literary merits of the text, with copious examples; the third dealing with its reception in England, both officially and in the parishes. The latter

sections are of great interest in understanding the struggle between the Conservative and Protestant elements in the Henrician church, and the effects of the first impact of Bible reading on priest and people. One can perhaps imagine the stir in the Salisbury diocese when the clergy received their instructions from Bishop Shaxton not only to read the Bible daily, but also to learn by heart at least one chapter a fortnight. Dr Mozley has in effect written not only a study of Coverdale but also a history of the English Bible during the critical period from 1530 to 1558, and, in addition, a valuable account for the student of English literature of writings which so greatly influenced the future of the language.

This cannot be called a popular book, although there is much in it of interest to the general reader. Sometimes the discussion of difficult problems tends to interrupt the narrative, while the writer's style is not always as lucid as one would wish. Reference to the book would be greatly simplified by the addition of a table explaining the many abbreviations used. The work is well printed, bound, and produced, and efficiently indexed. It contains 360 pages, of which fifty are devoted to appendices and indices. A frontispiece illustrates the title-page of Coverdale's Bible of 1535, but there is no doubt that the interest and value of the book would have been greatly increased had more generous reproduction of pages from the Bibles discussed been possible. But when one has been given so much, it is perhaps a little ungracious to ask for more.

St John's College,
Durham.

L. C. Stanbridge.

Stand Therefore! By Michael Furse. S.P.C.K. 17s. 6d.

What a blessing that in this bewildering world with its innumerable question-marks and problems one may occasionally meet a man like Michael Furse, for whom such things simply do not exist. He knows his way through the maze and follows it without fear of consequence. For him the choice is between white and black, not between varying shades of grey, and having chosen white he can be trusted not to waver in his decision. The very title of his book is characteristic of its author. Wherever he chooses to stand he will remain till kingdom come and you may be sure the position will be a strong one.

This rock-like stability is not due to any lack of brain power or to want of respect for the other man's viewpoint, but to the way God made him. A donkey once died of starvation with what seemed an equally satisfying carrot to right and to left of him. Many of us suffer a similar temperamental handicap. Not so the bishop. He was made to be a leader of men, and those under his command would soon know the meaning of order and discipline, and because they would inevitably love him they would find it difficult not to follow him *almost* anywhere: almost, because honesty would compel some to take another line albeit in fear and trembling.

The force of his personality is evident on every page of this auto-

biography. Not many bishops were consulted by Lloyd George on the conduct or misconduct of the first World War—"What would you do if you were in charge of this business?" (p. 77). Furse told him in no uncertain terms exactly what he would do—and what is more, his advice was immediately followed and the course of history was changed.

How many junior bishops, fresh from overseas, would have made their voices heard or heeded by their elder brothers on the English bench? Furse did so at once and *inter alia* put synodical government of home dioceses back on the map for them all and into regular and effectual practice in his own at St Albans without delay in 1921.

Fifteen years later he and one other stood alone in the Upper House of the Canterbury Convocation on the marriage question. For Furse it was not a question: the requirements of the Church of England were as plain as a pikestaff, and needless to say still are. The fact that he was opposed by so many of a sincerity and learning equal to his own did not shake his conviction—it may even have caused the majority to wonder whether this Athanasius was right after all.

The Church at home and in South Africa is well aware of its debt to this able and valiant fighter, who is at heart a single-minded lover of Christ and of his fellow men, and his host of friends will enjoy this forthright record of a full and fearless life.

WINDSOR. ERIC HAMILTON: BP.

SHORTER NOTICES

VERHEISSUNG UND ERFÜLLUNG. By Werner Georg Kümmel. Zwingli-Verlag, Zürich. Fr. 15.60.

This is the second edition, revised and much expanded, of a book which was first published in 1945. It is a study of the eschatological message of Jesus. The author considers that a re-examination of the Synoptic material is justified, as no agreement has yet been reached on its interpretation. He begins by discussing the terms and passages which convey the idea of the imminent future consummation of the reign of God. Jewish apocalyptic concepts do not occupy a prominent place in the teaching of Jesus and do not provide a key to the interpretation of his eschatological message. The author goes on to examine those passages which proclaim that the Kingdom of God is present in the mission of Jesus.

Since there is this apparent tension between futurist and realized eschatology, neither of which can be jettisoned, a satisfactory explanation must be sought. The author rejects any theories of development in the eschatological thought of Jesus, and also those which eliminate the concept of time. Though the few predictions, which imply the coming of the *eschaton* within the lifetime of a generation, were not fulfilled, the futurist element cannot be discarded. It is bound together with the realized eschatology and both

are equally essential. Professor Kümmel's thesis may be summarized in a free translation of his own words, "Promise and fulfilment are inseparably linked and condition one another. For promise becomes certainty through the fulfilment which has already taken place in Jesus, and fulfilment, provisional and hidden, loses its character as *skandalon* only in the knowledge of the promise yet to be ratified" (p. 147).

The writer shows himself fully aware of the extensive literature on the subject, including many English books, and in copious footnotes provides what often amounts to a discussion with the exponents of differing interpretations. The book also contains a wealth of exegetical and critical material, and though at times the reader may feel unable to follow the writer in some of the details of his arguments, he will nevertheless agree, I think, that Professor Kümmel has substantiated his thesis.

DURHAM. K. H. KUHN.

THE BIBLE DOCTRINE OF SIN. By C. Ryder Smith. Epworth Press. 20s.

The post-critical view that the Scriptures contain an organic, unified theology has been considerably assisted by the independent researches of Dr Ryder Smith. To his existing studies in the Bible doctrines of Society, of Salvation, and of Man, he has added a demonstration of its coherent teaching about Sin. He follows his usual method of a detailed examination of terms, considering the various expressions for Sin, their cognates and antitheses, in the Old Testament, the Septuagint and Apocrypha, and in the New Testament. The influence upon later usage of the writers of that period which he designates as "from Hebrew into Greek" is well illustrated.

The general reader, for whom the book is presumably intended (since all the Hebrew and Greek terms are transliterated), will find nothing novel about the author's conclusion—that all the Biblical terms relating to Sin "run back to the one concept: 'To disobey God is to sin.' " The reference of the sub-title—"and of the Ways of God with Sinners"—to the reaction of the Holy and Loving One towards this fundamental disobedience raises expectations of a more extensive treatment of the subject and many lacunae are left to be completed from the author's other works, especially those on Salvation and Grace (not yet published). The more advanced student will regret also that Dr Smith makes no use of the Covenant-idea to explain the earliest Old Testament notions of Sin and that little stress is laid on the demonic conception of Sin in the New Testament. No reference is made to the personification of Sin in Gen. 4. 7 and Zech. 5. 5 ff.; only slight attention is given to the personal treatment of *hē Hamartia* and the problems it raises, e.g. in John 8. 34 or Rom. 5–7.

Dr Smith's main weakness seems to be his failure to show the significance of that change in outlook upon Sin which the New Testa-

ment exhibits. It is a transition that has been described as "from the dramatic to the common-place". "Sin is rebellion"—this is the consensus of Old Testament teaching; for the New Testament writers Sin is an influence less startling but more insidious, to be described in such every-day metaphors as dirt, disease, darkness, and debt. Although Dr Smith argues cogently that "just as the whole doctrine of salvation culminates in Christ, so the whole doctrine of sin culminates in a sin against *Him*", yet of those crucial insights which the New Testament terms provide into what Sin *meant to Jesus* he says disappointingly little.

Bishop's University,
Lennoxville, Que.,
Canada.

H. Lewis Clarke.

The Hope of Jesus. By Roderic Dunkerley. Longmans. 15s.

"I am not much impressed by R. H. Lightfoot's Bampton Lectures", writes Dr Dunkerley on page 127. But there is no lack of more reliable authorities: James Stalker made some good points in his *Life of Jesus Christ* (p. 190), Vladimir G. Simkhovitch "saw the central issue very clearly" (p. 39), A. C. Hogg wrote a remarkable little book, and W. F. Cooley is also helpful (p. 42). Sometimes, too, prophetic laymen have seen more into the inner purpose of Jesus than theologians held in the "deadly grip" of traditionalism (p. 216), as when Mr Lloyd George recognized that the doctrines of Jesus were revolutionary and subversive. For, as a matter of history, it was for some such reason that Jesus was murdered. There was certainly no theological necessity for him to die, and the prophets of the Old Testament had not foretold that the Messiah would have to die. Chapter xiii of Dr Dunkerley's book is a discussion of What Might Have Been if "something better than what happened" had not been prevented by human sin.

Nevertheless there is big hope for the future. "There is still—and ever—a Hope of Jesus." The Kingdom may be near—or as Mr Wells put it (quoted, p. 205), "A great order of human life, a reign of justice and world-wide happiness, of plenty . . . and gigantic creative effort, lies close at hand". And the power that will order the world on the basis of brotherhood? The power of Woman! This was the great insight of Benjamin Kidd (five pages for him): "Woman is the psychic centre of power in the social integration." (At this point we expected to read that the auditory in Keble chapel withdrew to seek the "regenerators of the human race"—at L.M.H.?—but, alas! there was another Benjamin Kidd.)

There is also another way of spending fifteen shillings.

Cuddesdon College,
Oxford.

Wilfrid Browning.

BOOKS RECEIVED

(Mention here neither implies nor precludes subsequent comment.)

ABINGDON-COKESBURY PRESS: John Bright, *The Kingdom of God* ($3.15).

AUBIER (PARIS): Jean Guitton, *Le problème de Jésus*, 2 vols. (390 frs. and 690 frs.); Maurice Nédoncelle, *De la Fidélité* (480 frs.).

A. AND C. BLACK: Royden Keith Yerkes, *Sacrifice in Greek and Roman Religions and Early Judaism* (18s.); Gregory Dix, *The Image and Likeness of God* (6s. 6d. and 5s.).

BLACKFRIARS PUBLICATIONS: Vincent McNabb, O.P., *Faith and Prayer* (13s. 6d.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS: H. H. Price, *Some Aspects of the Conflict between Science and Religion* (3s. 6d.).

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS (for DUKE UNIVERSITY PRESS): G. R. Elliott, *Flaming Minister* (34s.).

CAREY KINGSGATE PRESS: G. Henton Davies, *The Approach to the Old Testament* (1s. 6d.).

CASSELL: Robert Graves and Joshua Podro, *The Nazarene Gospel Restored* (63s.).

EDIZIONI DI STORIA E LETTERATURA (ROME): Tiburtius Gallus, S.J., *Interpretatio Mariologica Protoevangelii Posttridentina*, Part I (Lire 3,000).

FABER AND FABER: Leslie Paul, *The English Philosophers* (25s.).

FRANCKE VERLAG (BERNE): Curt Kuhl, *Die Entstehung des alten Testaments* (n.p.).

HODDER AND STOUGHTON: Gordon Rupp, *The Righteousness of God* (25s.).

INDEPENDENT PRESS: Ralf F. G. Calder (Ed.), *Proceedings of the Seventh International Congregational Church* (15s.).

J. H. KOK N.V. (KAMPEN, HOLLAND): Lewis B. Smedes, *The Incarnation: Trends in Modern Anglican Thought* (f. 5.50).

LONGMANS: Roger Lloyd, *An Adventure in Discipleship* (4s.); Jean Pierre Camus, *The Spirit of St François de Sales* (8s. 6d.).

LUTTERWORTH PRESS: L. E. Elliott-Binns, *The Early Evangelicals* (31s. 6d.).

MANCHESTER UNIVERSITY PRESS: C. H. Dodd, *New Testament Studies* (16s.).

MOWBRAY: Father Hughson, O.H.C., *Spiritual Letters* (15s.); L. M. Charles-Edwards, *Saints Alive!* (7s. 6d.); A Religious of C.S.M.V., *The Coming of the Lord—A Study in the Creed* (6s.); Evelyn Underhill, *An Anthology of the Love of God* (12s. 6d.); John S. Higgins, *The General Thanksgiving* (5s.).

NISBET: A. Victor Murray, *Education into Religion* (14s.).

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS: John Searle, *Verses from St Augustine or Specimens from a Rich Mine* (6s.).

PRESENT QUESTION CONFERENCE: J. H. Oldham and others, *Springs of Action* (3s. 6d.).

ROCKLIFF: Conrad Bonifazi, *Christendom Attacked* (21s.); Paul-Louis Landsberg, *The Experience of Death and the Moral Problem of Suicide* (8s. 6d.).

S.C.M. PRESS: Lesslie Newbigin, *The Household of God* (12s. 6d.); Oliver S. Tomkins (Ed.), *The Third World Conference on Faith and Order* (21s.); W. A. Visser 't Hooft, *The Meaning of Ecumenical* (2s.); Norman Sykes, *The English Religious Tradition* (7s. 6d.).

S.P.C.K.: Theodore Andrews, *The Polish National Catholic Church in America and Poland* (12s. 6d.); Hans Werner Bartsch (Ed.), *Kerygma and Myth*, (22s. 6d.); Some Priests of the Anglican Communion, *Infallible Fallacies—An Anglican Reply to Roman Catholic Arguments* (1s.).

STEVENS AND SONS: A. L. Goodhart, Q.C., *English Law and the Moral Law* (12s. 6d.).

Printed in Great Britain by
Billing and Sons Ltd., Guildford and Esher